



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

prophets. Isaiah crowds into one picture the deliverance of the people from Babylonian captivity and their restoration to the promised land with Messianic redemption, the admission of all nations into the Kingdom of God, and finally the creation of the new heavens and the new earth. Thus also it is in N. T. prophecy. Christ associates the destruction of Jerusalem with the end of the world.

THE RESULTS OF MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM.*

BY PROF. D. G. LYON, PH. D.,

Hollis Professor of Divinity, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Biblical Criticism is the application to the Bible of the modern spirit of inquiry. It has for its object the fixing of the scriptural text, the exegesis of individual passages and of the biblical books as wholes and the determination of the date and authorship of the various books of the Bible. As thus defined, biblical criticism does not differ from the critical study of any other ancient writings and it has no canons which do not belong to the criticism of other books. For the establishment of the text, in cases where the text is in doubt, criticism makes use of manuscripts, of parallel passages, of versions, of quotations and sometimes of conjecture. For the exegesis, date and authorship it receives help from every source which gives any information of the writer and his times.

Associated with the questions as to the authorship of any given passage, comes the further inquiry as to the origin of the ideas contained therein. Finding, for instance, in the book of Genesis certain narratives, and in other parts of the Pentateuch certain institutions, which existed in a somewhat different form among other peoples, criticism asks, Are these traditions and institutions original with this or with that people, or do they go back to a still earlier source? There is indeed no conceivable question of any possible relation to the Bible which criticism hesitates to ask.

The spirit in which this all-inquisitive science pursues its investigations is worthy of special remark. We sometimes hear of "hostile" criticism and not seldom of "advanced" criticism, which is also suspected of hostility. While some of those engaged in the study are known to be devout men, who love the Bible, others are viewed with distrust, as if they hated the best of all books and examined it with the express object of covering it with contempt. Nothing could be more erroneous than this opinion. While many biblical critics may be hos-

tile to certain views which many other persons hold regarding the Scriptures, yet neither the science of criticism nor any serious student of the science is hostile to the Bible itself. Indeed, criticism would cease to be science the instant it began to hate. On the other hand, biblical criticism does not love the Bible. In common with all science its only aim and its only love is truth. The Bible is to it what the stars are to the astronomer or the flowers to botany—the field of its exploration within which it seeks the truth. Biblical criticism as criticism is the same whether practiced by a pietist or a rationalist. The term “devout criticism” would be impossible—fully as much as the term “Christian science.” The spirit of a critic may be Christian or otherwise; science has no religion and is hostile to none. To every subject which she approaches she comes with the same calm and impassive spirit. Her only enthusiasm is in the pursuit of the truth and in the conviction that her search shall be rewarded.

In seeking for truth as to the Bible, biblical criticism subjects to the severest test every statement bearing on the subject, whether found in the Bible itself or in so-called profane history or from whatever source it comes.

Toward the supernatural it manifests the same impartial spirit. It does not demand extra-human instrumentality where it sees sufficient explanation in the human. At the same time it does not deny the supernatural when the claim is supported by sufficient evidence. Criticism does not deny miracle, far less does it deny that impalpable influence from above which mysteriously acted on the minds of the worthies of the Bible.

Toward the consequences of its own research it is equally unheeding. In vain to say, You endanger the creed or the basis of morals and of good society. A change in the creed concerns criticism no more than a change in the weather and it has as little to do with morals as with religion. To all who would reproach her she replies, Truth for its own sake is my aim and truth cannot conflict with good. This absence of theological interest and disregard of warning has caused biblical criticism to be often misunderstood and has won for her not a few enemies. Conscious of clean hands and pure motives she leaves her vindication to the future. She has no personal aims. What she to-day holds to be ascertained she will gladly surrender to-morrow if disproved or exchange for larger truth. For her one step nearer truth is worth more than the applause of worlds, one step from the truth more painful than the reproach of worlds.

To a certain extent all intelligent readers of the Bible are critics, but by the results of biblical criticism can be meant, of course, only

the results which have been reached by specialists. The objection that specialists are not always agreed can, so far as it is well-founded, only give larger liberty to non-specialists, but cannot take out of the specialists' hand the right to answer a multitude of questions which none other can answer. In deciding the date and authorship of a psalm the opinion of a specialist is worth that of a thousand who have not studied the subject. Majorities count as little here as they did when the earth was regarded as plane and immovable. All that the layman can do in the case of any science is to accept the results reached by specialists, or if these are for any reason distrusted or distasteful he must possess himself of the materials and the methods, in other words become himself a specialist and give to others the truth. This proposition is so clear as to need no elaboration. On any given ethical question the voice of the combined world may not be worth comparing to that of one man who has made a thorough study of that question. What is obvious in regard to all other sciences ought to be obvious in regard to the science of biblical criticism.

Certain parts of the results of biblical criticism are necessarily negative, because the materials for a positive judgment are wanting. This is particularly true as to the authorship of various writings. To many other questions criticism feels bound to return an answer at variance with the oldest tradition. Without being able to offer a substitute she is often able to say that an existing view is certainly wrong. Hence the widespread opinion that biblical criticism is essentially negative and destructive. But if she thus acknowledges the limits of her power, she commends herself by the act; and if she appears in the role of iconoclast, it is that she may remodel the fragment into a statue of more beautiful proportions.

Criticism is more decidedly constructive than destructive. It takes a tradition, shows its relation to the same tradition found elsewhere and makes it for the first time intelligible. It shows that a psalm which has been ascribed to David was written by an unknown hand centuries later and the psalm acquires at once new meaning. A book of prophecies supposed to date from a certain time and author it shows to belong a century and a half later, and thus the book once presented in its historical setting glows with light, revealing the life of its times and receiving new life from its times. Criticism may rob the theologian of a proof-text but by showing the true meaning it puts honor on the Bible. In curbing the wild career of the spiritualizer, who sees a double meaning in all parts of the Bible, it does not fail incidentally to provide the homilist with new and solid material for instruction. The Bible in ceasing to be a magical book, from which anybody can prove

anything, becomes of vastly increased value for history and religion. The biblical writers become veritable flesh and blood, at once the product and the authors of their times. The life which they live becomes real. Their struggles are such as we daily pass through. To them spoke the same divine voice which comes to us. In a word they are our brethren living in their times and speaking to their times. The Bible by thus becoming more real, becomes more helpful. If criticism had accomplished no work but this, it would be a science worthy of all recognition and welcome.

The subject of the results of modern biblical criticism is so broad that a full discussion would be a large volume on biblical introduction. Even a full catalogue of results without discussion would make a lengthy paper. A short essay must content itself with naming some of the chief results, illustrating one or two of these by brief discussion. In order somewhat to narrow the subject what follows will be confined exclusively to the Old Testament.

One of the first and surest conclusions of criticism is that the Pentateuch in its present form is not the work of Moses. The book as a whole nowhere claims to have been written by Moses, and criticism shows that it was not written by any individual, but is a growth, having many authors and covering a long period of time. Some of the parts, for instance, the itinerancy of the wanderings in the wilderness and certain collections of laws may indeed date from the time of Moses. Other parts were written after the rise of monarchy in Israel and still others after the full development of the ritual. The order which the books of the Pentateuch now have does not represent the order of time in which they were written for the book of Deuteronomy is older than Leviticus. The author or authors of each of the books perhaps made use of written materials which were at hand and most of the books bear traces of successive revisions. Genesis is composed of several writings brought together, whose differences are in some cases so striking as to be plainly noticeable even in a translation; for instance, the two accounts of creation and of the deluge. With respect to the narratives of creation, criticism has shown that the literal interpretation is the only justifiable one and that the literal correctness of these narratives cannot in the light of other sciences be maintained. It shows also that various passages, such as Balaam's prophecy, which have been supposed to refer to the coming Messiah, have a totally different reference, while the blessing of Jacob was written after the establishment of the tribes rather than at the beginning of their history. Many of the pentateuchal etymologies of proper names are of more than doubtful correctness; the derivation of Babel, for example,

the name of the city Babylon, from a verb meaning to confound (Gen. XI., 9) being a hopeless attempt to explain a word whose meaning was probably unknown to the writer.

The historical books of the Old Testament biblical criticism has shown to be not always chronological accounts of the times to which they refer. The book of Judges, for instance, gives most valuable material for the times preceding the monarchy, less in the form of history than of pictures set in an artificial chronological frame-work and from these pictures criticism is able to some extent to reconstruct the history. The book is really a sermon intended to promote the worship of Jehovah. The books of Samuel and of Kings, in their present form the work of several different editors, composed to a considerable extent of older documents, partake also largely of the fragmentary character of the book of Judges. Repeating and supplementing the same material as the books of Samuel and Kings, the very late book of the Chronicles confines its attention to the fortunes of the house of David and to the interests of the Levitical law and temple-worship.

Criticism shows the prophetic books to be for the history of the centuries in which their writers lived of higher value than the historical books proper. Since the prophets preached and wrote for their own times, there are numerous allusions to political events at home and abroad and to the moral and religious condition of the people which at the same time fix the date of the prophet and elucidate the prophetic message. Thus the first Isaiah (Isa. I.-XXXIX.), in spite of the fact that the chronological order of his writings has become badly deranged, is for the picture of his times, but especially of Israel's foreign relations, of inestimable value. The second half of the book called Isaiah criticism has shown to belong to the closing years of the Babylonian Exile and to be of the first importance for this period. Criticism declares that our present book of Jeremiah has submitted to great changes at the hands of an editor, and that the book of Daniel was not written by a contemporary of the Exile but several generations later and is indeed in part real history cast into the form of visions. It shows that Jonah is written by a man who can scarcely himself have been familiar with the city of Nineveh, while Zechariah like Isaiah is the work of at least two different men separated from each other by long intervals of time.

To illustrate the work of criticism in another class of biblical writings. Criticism shows that the traditional authorship of the psalms is in most cases doubtful, and that some of the psalms date from the Exile and others possibly even later, so that it would be impossible to regard our Psalter as existing in its present form in the times of David

or Solomon. It shows also that the book of Ecclesiastes cannot be the production of Solomon but came from a much later writer, from one who had far less interest in the pleasures of this world than Solomon is supposed to have felt.

But one may ask, With what right does criticism in such a multitude of cases reach conclusions contrary to hoary tradition? Let a brief account of one or two cases afford a partial answer.

The present book of Isaiah consists of three distinct parts, a collection of prophecies with various historical notices (I.-XXXV.), a second collection of prophecies and exhortations (XL.-LXVI.), and these two collections are separated by four historical chapters (XXXVI.-XXXIX.). Criticism teaches that the second collection has not come from the same hand as the first. In the light of what we know of the close of the eighth and the beginning of the seventh century B. C., light coming from the Old Testament historical books, from other contemporary prophets, such as Hosea, from the extensive and growing cuneiform literature and from the first 39 chapters of the book of Isaiah itself—from what we know of this period by all these sources the conclusion is inevitable that the standpoint from which the writer of chapters XL.-LXVI. views events does not belong to these times. On the contrary, the whole coloring arises from the last years of the captivity in Babylon. In reply to the claim that a prophet of the early part of the seventh century may have been lifted out of his surroundings and transported into the midst of a state of affairs which did not exist till 150 years later, it must be said that all things indeed are possible, but a weak possibility must yield to a stronger probability. Why should Isaiah have been thus transferred into scenes so utterly unlike those of his times, when this has happened in the case of no other prophet? Why should he make no reference to the disaster which was to overtake Israel and Judah, but should view both kingdoms as long since overthrown, Jerusalem destroyed and the temple burnt? The people whom the prophet addresses are in Babylon and he comforts them with the promise of return to the land of their fathers. Babylon is now the great world-power, Assyria has passed away. The Persian empire is fast rising to sweep away the Babylonian and the fame and victories of Cyrus are familiar to the prophet. Otherwise also the tone is altogether different from that of the first 35 chapters. There is very little of prophecy against foreign nations. The Jews are no longer threatened with ruin because of their sins. They have already been crushed beneath the oppressor's foot, and are now penitently enduring the chastisements which God has laid upon them. The best element among them, the spiritual germ, rises almost to the personality of an

individual who by his patient sufferings expiates the sins of his people. But the end draws nigh. The Jews shall return to Palestine and become a blessing to the world. From Jerusalem shall go forth the law. She shall be called the city of Jehovah, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel, her people shall all be righteous and shall inherit the land forever. Now all this is perfectly natural to a prophet of the time of Cyrus but inexplicable as coming from a contemporary of Hezekiah. While there are still some students who are not convinced by such considerations, yet the conclusion that the present book of Isaiah was written by at least two men may be classed as one of the certain results of modern criticism. It is perhaps purely accidental that this unknown Isaiah came to be bound up along with the real Isaiah.

To return once more to the pentateuchal question. Criticism has concluded not only that Moses did not write the book of Deuteronomy but that he is not the author of any considerable part of the book. It is generally conceded that the book of the law of Jehovah found in the temple in the days of Josiah (2 Kgs. XXII.) was substantially our book of Deuteronomy. Until that time this book does not seem to have been known. Its provisions as to places of sacrifices and priestly orders are very explicit. Yet pious judges, kings and prophets disregarded these provisions for a succession of centuries, and that without apparent consciousness that they were violating any law, and Samuel could hardly have acted as he is reported to have done when the people of Israel demanded a king (1 Sam. VIII.) if he had dreamed that the great law-giver had already made provision for the election of such a sovereign (Deut. XVII.).

Much later than Deuteronomy criticism places the highly developed ritual of the book of Leviticus. The point of view is in many respects totally different from that of the ritual portions of Deuteronomy. Criticism brings a mass of argument to show that Leviticus was written at a time when the voice of the prophets no longer echoed with its living power, when the religious life of the people had lost its glow and was degenerating into that dead formalism which is so sharply rebuked in the gospels of the New Testament.

But such results, one says, are mainly negative. True, they put the negative on a large number of conceptions which in our minds have been inseparably associated with the Old Testament. But criticism does not stop here. It proceeds to rebuild and in the new structure all of the old material finds its place. It undertakes in all seriousness to reconstruct the history of that people from the midst of whom the Old Testament sprung. The separate writings of this collection mark the stages through which the life of that wonderful people passed.

Criticism gathers them up, re-arranges them according to the data and thus gives us a consecutive history of the life of Israel. It sees in the Old Testament numerous indications of a time when the national life was forming, a collection of nomadic tribes binding themselves together by common interest and devoted to the same mode of religious worship. This formative period continues for a long time, the leadership of the people passing easily from one hero to another, according as each distinguished himself by his prowess or his wisdom. During this period the established and regulated religious and social order of later times does not exist, each man is his own priest, there are many sacred places and there is a constant tendency to the worship of the gods of the surrounding nations. At last Saul arises and is acknowledged king. Under him and his immediate successor the work of consolidation and centralization are so successfully carried on that Solomon finds himself the head of a united people. But in the days of his successor a schism occurs and the kingdoms of Israel and Judah are involved in constant wars. During this period arises a class of preachers called prophets, zealous advocates of the worship of Jehovah, seeking to banish the worship of other gods from among the people. These prophets have left no literary remains possibly excepting fragments which may have furnished material for later books. Following them came the race of writing prophets, mighty preachers of righteousness, still seeking to win the people from idolatry to which they so tenaciously clung. By degrees the priestly class also rose in importance and stood by the prophets in the fight for Jehovah, but, in contrast with the moral righteousness insisted upon by the latter, these were more concerned with ceremonial righteousness. The centralized government and the attempts to centralize the worship proved favorable to the development of the priestly power. As the political fortunes of the northern kingdom grow more precarious, the great prophets Isaiah and Hosea arise to insist on fidelity to Jehovah and the necessity of moral goodness. Israel passes away and Judah hastens to its end. In spite of the prophets and of royal attempts to repress idolatry the people continue to worship other gods. At last a book, which is essentially our book of Deuteronomy, is published. But the ruin cannot be stayed. Jerusalem is destroyed. Jeremiah and Ezekiel continue to preach righteousness and the second Isaiah rises to heights not attained by any other prophet. With the return from captivity there is no more royal pomp and no more need of voices raised against idolatry. There are no more great prophets. The worship of the one God has indeed become fixed and this is a vast stride. But at the same time the priestly form has triumphed over the prophetic word

of life, the ritual as it exists in Leviticus is wrought out, and a religious formalism arises which grows more burdensome until the great Teacher of the New Testament takes up again the message of the prophets and proclaims the necessity of moral righteousness.

By this reconstruction of the history, this consecutive view of Israel's life, criticism robs us of nothing and gives us much. Royalty, prophecy and priesthood become intelligible. At the same time the Old Testament loses none of its claim to reverence. In those parts which are of most value for the religious life, the devotional parts, most specially of the psalms and of the prophets, there is a wonderful gain in understanding, in beauty and in usefulness. The life of the writers and actors did not move forward in prepared grooves. It was real life struggling toward the light, toward the truth, toward God. No one can view the men of the Old Testament in this character without having his sympathies enlisted and without drawing from their lives and words lessons of wisdom for this world and for the world to come. All hail then the science which reveals the hidden life of Israel and unlocks for our use the treasures of the incomparable productions which spring from that life!

CHRONOLOGICAL.

BY PROF. H. G. MITCHELL, Ph. D.,
Boston University, Boston, Mass.

It would at first sight appear an easy matter to construct a chronology of the Kings of Judah and Israel. One would think it necessary only to fix almost any date and reckon backward or forward, testing one's calculations by comparing the two columns, thus constructed. Any one who has made such an attempt knows that the problem is by no means so simple. There are, indeed, those who have declared it insoluble. Probably no one has offered a solution which would be generally accepted. The present writer does not claim to have met all the difficulties in the case. He merely asks attention to certain suggestions which may throw light especially upon the chronology of the eighth century before Christ.

The discrepancies to be explained are apparent from the following table, constructed as one would naturally arrange the data given in the second book of Kings. The starting-point is the year 721 B. C., as about the date of the fall of Samaria. The references show whence the data used have been obtained.

B. C.	JUDAH.	ISRAEL.
821.....	15 of Amaziah.....	{ 1 of Jeroboam II. (14, 23). 13 " " (15, 1).
807.....	1 of Uzziah.....	{ 15 " " (14, 21). 27 " " (15, 1).
793.....	15 " "	41 " " (14, 23).
770.....	38 " "	Zechariah (15, 8).